

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by European publication EP 1 083 405 A1 to Hirayama ("Hirayama").

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,169,972 to Kono et al. ("Kono").

Claims 1-11 are objected to.

The Title is allegedly not descriptive.

The Specification is objected to.

The Drawings are objected to.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant amended claims 1-8 and 10-11.

Applicant canceled claim 9 without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicant amended the Title.

Applicant amended the Specification.

Applicant submits concurrently herewith a Submission of Replacement Sheets of Drawings.

Matters of Form

The Title is objected to as allegedly being not descriptive. Applicant has amended the Title to address the Examiner's concern. Withdrawal of the objection to the Title is requested.

The Specification is objected to. Applicant has amended the Specification to address the Examiner's concerns at paragraph 2 of the Office Action. Withdrawal of the objection to the Specification is requested.

The Drawings are objected to. Applicant submits concurrently herewith a Submission of Replacement Sheets of Drawings. Fig. 13 is being amended to include the legend "Related Art." Applicant submits that no new matter is added in the substitute drawing sheets. Withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is requested.

Claims 1-11 are objected to. Applicant has amended the claims to address the Examiner's concerns at paragraph 4 of the Office Action. However, Applicant submits that the claim amendments that address the Examiner's concerns at paragraph 4 of the Office Action merely correct language translation errors and matters of form, and in no way narrow the scope of the claims.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Hirayama. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kono. Applicant has canceled claim 9 without prejudice or disclaimer rendering all rejections of claim 9 moot. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(a) and 102(e), of claims 1-8 and 10-11. Applicant has amended claims 1, 8, 10 and 11 to particularly point out and

distinctly claim the invention. Claim 1 recites a speech recognition unit, including a plurality of speech recognition dictionaries, a selector, an extractor, a storage, and a recognizer. A desired dictionary having a high frequency of use is selected, extracted and stored as a list of queuing words at a higher-order hierarchy than a hierarchy set beforehand together with a normal dictionary extracted by the extractor. The recognizer recognizes input speech by comparing the input speech and the list of queuing words stored in the storage. Thus, for example, as described at page 19, line 11 – page 20, line 20, and illustrated in Figs. 2-3 of Applicant's specification, a user may set a dictionary of hospitals 302 at a higher-order hierarchy than a hierarchy set beforehand, together with a normal dictionary such as category name dictionary 301, as an object of speech recognition. In this example, because Dr. Saito's office is included in the dictionary of hospitals 302, the retrieval process is finished by one vocalization, rather than by successive vocalizations such as in the arrangement illustrated in Fig. 13. Moreover, a user may set a dictionary of hospitals 302 at a higher-order hierarchy than a hierarchy set beforehand because the dictionary of hospitals 302 has a high frequency of use.

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Hirayama nor Kono teach or suggest at least the features of a desired dictionary having a high frequency of use being selected, extracted and stored as a list of queuing words at a higher-order hierarchy than a hierarchy set beforehand together with a normal dictionary extracted by the extractor, as recited in claim 1.

Claim 8 recites a speech recognition method, including preparing dictionaries classified according to at least one narrowing-down condition set by a user beforehand, the frequency of use of which is high. Claim 10 recites a speech recognition unit, including a dictionary classified according to at least one narrowing-down condition set by a user beforehand, the frequency of

use of which is high. Claim 11 recites a speech recognition method, including extracting a dictionary classified according to at least one narrowing-down condition set by a user beforehand, the frequency of use of which is high. Again, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Hirayama nor Kono teach or suggest at least the features of dictionaries classified according to at least one narrowing-down condition set by a user beforehand, the frequency of use of which is high, as recited in claims 8, 10 and 11.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and recite the same combination of allowable features recited in claim 1, as well as additional features that define over the prior art. Accordingly, it is requested that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(a) and 102(e), of claims 1-8 and 10-11, be withdrawn. Applicant submits that all pending claims, *i.e.* claims 1-8 and 10-11, are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Dated: August 26, 2004

By: 

Peter J. Sistare

Registration No. 48,183

CUSTOMER NO. 009629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

202.739.3000